

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/676,434	09/30/2003	Sriram Natarajan	2003P14384US	7054
7	7590 09/07/2005		EXAM	INER
Siemens Corporation			RIELLEY, ELIZABETH A	
Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator Intellectual Property Department			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
170 Wood Avenue South			2879	
Iselin, NJ 08	830		D. III . C. IV III . C. IV . C	_

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/676,434	NATARAJAN ET AL.	(h
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Elizabeth A. Rielley	2879	
۔ Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
WHICI - Extens after S - If NO ; - Failure Any re	PRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (X 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Deenod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period version to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing of patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ARANDONE	N. nety filed the mailing date of this communic D. (35 U.S.C. & 133)	
Status				
1) 🔀	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 So</u>	entember 2003		
		action is non-final.		
•—	Since this application is in condition for allowar		occution on to the monit	- i-
	closed in accordance with the practice under E			SIS
	on of Claims	n parte Quayre, 1999 C.D. 11, 40	0.G. 213.	
<u> </u>				
	Claim(s) <u>1-50</u> is/are pending in the application.			
	a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	vn from consideration.		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
	Claim(s) is/are rejected.		•	
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)⊠ (Claim(s) <u>1-50</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.		
Applicatio	n Papers			
9)□ T	he specification is objected to by the Examine	1.		
10)∐ T	he drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) objected to by the E	Examiner.	
	applicant may not request that any objection to the o			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti			1(d)
11) 🗌 T	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152	
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) 1 2 3	cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents Certified copies of the priority documents Copies of the certified copies of the priorical application from the International Bureau ethe attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage	
2)	s) of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	(PTO-413) te atent Application (PTO-152)	

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-16 and 28-39, drawn to a method of manufacturing an OLED, classified in class

427, subclass 66.

II. Claims 17-27, drawn to an OLED, classified in class 313, subclass 504.

III. Claims 40-50, drawn to an organic polymer classified in class 252, subclass 301.16.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case one may make an OLED with an aqueous dispersion of the polymer.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case one may used the product to make a textured fluorescent layer on paper.

Inventions II and II are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably

Art Unit: 2879

distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as it may make the product with an aqueous dispersion of the polymer; and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species 1, a first solvent chosen from page 10 first full paragraph.

Species 2, a second solvent chose from page 10, first full paragraphs

Species 3, an organic polymer chosen from page 10 second full paragraph.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, the following claims are generic:

Application/Control Number: 10/676,434 Page 4

Art Unit: 2879

Species 1, claims 1-3, 5-30, 32-42, 44-50;

Species 2, claims 1-3, 5-30, 32-42, 44-50;

Species 3, claims 1-10, 14-22, 26-34, 38-46, and 50.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Art Unit: 2879

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth A. Rielley whose telephone number is 571-272-2117. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar Patel can be reached on 571-272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chzaluth Killey
Elizabeth Rielley

Examiner Art Unit 2879 MARICELI SANTIAGO